

<i>Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary</i>	Application No. 10/536,463	Applicant(s) VENKATASUBRAMANIAN ET AL.	
	Examiner GOLAM MOWLA	Art Unit 1795	

All Participants:

(1) GOLAM MOWLA.

(2) Scott C. Hatfield.

Date of Interview: 8 July 2009

Type of Interview:

☒ Telephonic
☐ Video Conference
☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant ☐ Applicant's representative)

Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: ☐ Yes ☐ No
If Yes, provide a brief description: .

Part I.

Rejection(s) discussed:
Pending rejections

Claims discussed:
Pending claims

Prior art documents discussed:
Venkatasubramanian (US 6,300,150 B1)

Part II.

SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED:
See Continuation Sheet

Part III.

☒ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.

☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.

/Alexa D. Neckel/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 1795
/G. M./
Examiner, Art Unit 1795

(Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature – if appropriate)

Status of Application: _____

(3) _____.

(4) _____.

Time: _____

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed: Proposed claim amendment to place the application in condition for allowance. Examiner suggested to define the first and third temperature stages to include either heat-source or heat-drain in order to overcome the art of record (Venkatasubramanian (US 6,300,150 B1)). Applicant argued that the art of record do not teach a unipolar couple that is series connected to the first, second and third temperature stages. Examiner pointed to figure 9 of the art of record wherein the metal slabs are interpreted as the temperature stages and the unipolar couple is series connected to the first, second and third legs. However, Applicant further pointed out to claim 2 and 56 and argued that the art of record do not teach the recited limitations of claims 2 and 56 because where two adjacent p-type elements are coupled through electrical shorts (indicated by an "x" in Figure 8 of Venkatasubramanian), one of the two adjacent p-type elements does "not participate in the current transport through the thickness of the film." Venkatasubramanian, col. 4, lines 63-65. Accordingly, Venkatasubramanian does not disclose or suggest currents flowing in opposite directions in first and second legs of a same electrical conductivity type of a unipolar couple element as recited in claim 2 and claim 56.